

APPLICANT(S): ARIDOR, Yariv *et al.*  
SERIAL NO.: 10/631,620  
FILED: July 16, 2003  
Page 9

### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-19 and 24-29 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended, to correct a typographical error.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to claim 1 adds no new matter.

### **The Telephone Interview**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Nathan E. Price, for granting and attending the telephone interview with Applicants' Representatives on April 17, 2008, in which the rejection of claims 1-19 and 24-29 was discussed.

In the telephone interview no agreement was reached between the Examiner and Applicants' Representatives, regarding the rejection of claims 1-19 and 24-29. However, the Examiner suggested that Applicants' Representatives submit their arguments in writing for the Examiner's reconsideration.

### **Claim Objections**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 1 and stated that a "period" character has been added in the one-before-last paragraph, which made it unclear where the claim ends.

Claim 1 has been amended, by replacing the "period" character in the one-but-last paragraph with a "comma" character. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 1 be removed.

APPLICANT(S): ARIDOR, Yariv *et al.*  
SERIAL NO.: 10/631,620  
FILED: July 16, 2003  
Page 10

## CLAIM REJECTIONS

### 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1–19 and 24–29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Carlson (U.S. Patent 6,697 849) in view of Choquier et al. (U.S. Patent 5,951,694) and in view of Watt (U.S. Publication 2003/0126202).

Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 1, 24, and 25, include features that are not taught or suggested by Carlson, Choquier, and/or Watt, taken individually or in any combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1–19 and 24–29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Specifically, none of the cited references, taken individually or in combination, teaches at least the claimed feature “*wherein the framework is capable of managing multiple application complexes of different types based on the configuration information provided by said plugin for each respective application-complex type*”, as recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 25.

The Examiner argues that Carlson, in columns 3, 4, 9, 11 and 12, suggests managing application complexes of different types, according to their respective types. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Carlson describes, at most, changing basic configuration parameters in order to change system performance. Carlson does not disclose, teach or suggest providing configuration information by plugins which correspond to application-complex types, as recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 25. . Furthermore, Carlson does not disclose, teach or suggest managing multiple application complexes of different types based on configuration information provided by plugins corresponding to application-complex types, as recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 25.

Additionally, none of the cited references, taken individually or in combination, teaches at least the claimed feature “*the tiers correspond to clusters in a given tier*”. The Examiner conceded that “*Carlson ... does not specifically state that a user populates the application complex with servers*”; and the Examiner contended that “*Choquier teaches allowing the user to populate the application complex with servers using input to said framework via a console*”, and that “*Choquier teaches running the same service application on servers of a group*”, relying on Choquier, column 7. However, Choquier merely describes

(e.g., in column 2, in its “Summary” section) replication across multiple servers, in which “Each application server of a service group is preferably a “replicated” version of the other application servers within the service group, meaning that each runs the same server application (or server applications) as the others to implement a common service”, and “for example, all application servers within the BBS service group preferably store identical copies of all BBS messages”. The replication system of Choquier, which operates on multiple servers such that “each runs the same server application” in order to “implement a common service” and to “store identical copies”, is fundamentally different from the framework capable of managing different applications according to their respective application-complex types, as recited in independent claims 1, 24 and 25.

In addition, the Examiner argues that Carlson, in columns 2-4, 10, and 13, teaches the content of the claimed plugin and the claimed operation of the plugin interface. Applicants respectfully disagree. Carlson does not disclose, teach or suggest plugins that provide information to configure the system according to respective application-complex types, as recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 25.

Furthermore, Carlson does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed feature “*wherein the framework, in cooperation with said plugin, is capable of applying configuration operations on application complexes of the respective application-complex type*”. In fact, Carlson does not disclose, teach or suggest any plugin interface capable of performing configuration.

It is noted that claims 1, 24, and 25 are directed to managing application complexes that are each “*definable via a respective application-complex type*”. Applicants’ claimed management framework is capable of managing and configuring multiple application complexes of different types in cooperation with plugins for the application complex types, thereby allowing dynamic and user-intervention-free management capability. It is respectfully asserted that none of the prior art references demonstrates such ability for managing different types of application complexes.

Furthermore, Carlson describes in column 9 that “a web server may have a web server plug in which includes a load balancer”, and that “the load balancer component of the web server plug-in may be configured, using an administrative tool, to use different level of granularity in making the response time decisions”. The configuration of the load balancer

APPLICANT(S): ARIDOR, Yariv *et al.*  
SERIAL NO.: 10/631,620  
FILED: July 16, 2003  
Page 12

component using the manual administrative tool in Carlson is fundamentally different from the claimed plug-in based configuration recited in independent claims 1, 24, and 25. For example, in Carlson, the load balancer, which is included in the component that Carlson refers to as a "plug-in", is configured using an administrative tool; whereas in independent claims 1, 24 and 25, it is the plug-in which provides configuration information for each application-complex type, and it is the framework which, in cooperation with the plugin, is capable of applying configuration operations on application complexes of the respective application-complex type.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 24, and 25 are patentable over the cited references. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2–19 and 26–29 are likewise patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Finally, Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's citation of non-applied references on page 11 of the Office Action, and respectfully assert that the pending claims distinguish over this art.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to Deposit Account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Suzanne Erez/  
Suzanne Erez  
Reg. No. 46,688  
Phone No. (972) 4-829-6069

Date: 20 May 2008  
IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Dept.  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598